

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 2 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

3		)	<b>Case No. 3:08-cv-2515</b>
4	RELIANT TECHNOLOGIES, INC., a	)	
5	corporation,	)	<b>Judge Maxine M. Chesney</b>
6	Plaintiff,	)	<b><u>[PROPOSED] ORDER</u></b>
7	vs.	)	
8	ROBERT LANE McDANIEL, an	)	
9	individual,	)	
	Defendant.	)	

10  
 11 Before the Court is Defendant Robert Lane McDaniel's Motion to Dismiss for Lack of  
 12 Personal Jurisdiction (Doc. 11) Reliant Technologies, Inc.'s ("Reliant") Amended Complaint for  
 13 cybersquatting, trademark infringement, common law unfair competition, and violation of the  
 14 California Unfair Practices Act, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200. Reliant opposed Defendant's  
 15 motion and has made a *prima facie* showing that this Court has personal jurisdiction over  
 16 Defendant. This is all that Reliant must show given the procedural posture of this motion. *See*  
 17 *Rio Properties, Inc. v. Rio Int'l Interlink*, 284 F.3d 1007, 1019 (9th Cir. 2002).

18 Specifically, Reliant has determined that Defendant purposefully directed his actions at  
 19 California by allegedly infringing the trademarks of Reliant, a California-based company, and by  
 20 registering a high proportion of domain names which combine Reliant's FRAXEL trademark  
 21 and California locations with the intent of contracting with physicians in those locations. *See*  
 22 *Panavision Int'l, L.P. v. Toepfen*, 141 F.3d 1316, 1321-22 (9th Cir. 1998). In addition, Reliant's  
 23 causes of action would not exist "but for" Defendant's actions directed at the forum, and the

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 exercise of jurisdiction in this forum would be reasonable. *Id.* at 1322-23. Accordingly, the  
2 Court may exercise personal jurisdiction over Defendant, and Defendant's motion must be  
3 **DENIED.**

4 **IT IS SO ORDERED**

5

6 Dated:

\_\_\_\_\_  
MAXINE M. CHESNEY  
United States District Judge

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28